

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **28 February 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-6, 8-18, 20-23, 25-35, 37-40, 42-52, 54 and 55. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-18, 20-23, 25-35, 37-40, 42-52, 54 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. 1, 3-6, 8, 11-14, 16, 18, 20-23, 25, 28-31, 33, 35, 37-40, 42, 45-48, 50, 52, 54 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadi (USPN 6,629,246, hereinafter “Gadi”), in view of Nevarez et al. (USPN 6,189,103 hereinafter “Nevarez”), and further in view of Sadovsky (USPN 5,689,638 hereinafter “Sadovsky”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-18, 20-23, 25-35, 37-40, 42-52, 54 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 to remove the limitation clauses “by verifying a digital signature and certificate chain for the remote computer system, thereby determining if the node is authorized to access the application,” which contain the phrase “the node.”

All other claims depend upon claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55. Hence they have also overcome the rejection as being indefinite, and in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17, 34, and 51 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claims 17, 34 and 51 have overcome the rejection under U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph after the amendments made in claims 1, 18, and 35 set forth above. Hence claims 17, 34 and 51 are in allowable condition.

Subsequently, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 to include the allowable subject matter in claims 17, 34, and 51. Claims 17, 34, and 51 have been canceled without prejudice.

New Claims (restored claims)

Applicant has added new claims 56, 57, 58, and 59. These new claims restored the previously canceled claims 2, 19, 36, and 53, respectively. Applicant correspondingly removed the same limitations from base claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 because, as the examiner points out, they have been disclosed in Gadi. Hence, no new matter has been added.

Applicant has also amended dependent claims 3, 20, 37, and 54 to update the dependencies of these claims because of the amended claims and new claims set forth above.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52 and 55 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-6, 8-16, and 56 which depend upon claim 1, claims 20-23, 25-33, and 57 which depend upon claim 18, claims 37-40, 42-50, and 58, which depend upon claim 35, and claims 54 and 59 which depend upon claim 52, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: May 22, 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com